



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE MONIST.

THE ARYANS AND THE ANCIENT ITALIANS.

A PAGE OF PRIMITIVE HISTORY.¹

THE ethnographical problem concerning the Aryan-speaking peoples seems to be solved, because there is a certain acquiescence in the opinion, advanced as early as the beginning of this century, that the Aryans before they settled where they have been historically found were divided into as many ethnical groups as there are peoples with national characteristics, like, for instance, the Italians and the Hellenes. It is true that Latham, Benfey Geiger, Pösche, and Penka have attempted to find a different solution of the problem. But the majority of archæologists and philologists have not been shaken from the old opinion, and have even interpreted by the assistance of the old hypothesis the facts recently brought to light. To me, however, it seems that the Aryan problem is not yet solved; and in spite of the labors of Italian archæologists that part of the question which relates to prehistoric Italy is still very obscure.

It is for this reason that I wish to present the results which I have reached by means of anthropological studies upon ancient Italy, and by means of a comparison between Italy and the other regions of Europe, in the hope that in the new form in which I

¹ Translated from the manuscript of Professor Sergi by I. W. Howerth, of the University of Chicago.

study the Aryan problem in Italy I may be able to throw some light upon the Aryan problem in Europe.

I.

From archæological discoveries at Villanova in the Province of Bologna, down to those at Tarquinia Corneto, at Vetulonia, and at Albalonga in Latium, there has been a question concerning the people or peoples of the first age of iron who left burying grounds with tombs for cremation, as to whether they were Etruscans or Umbrians, or Umbro-Latins. And from this has arisen the great contention concerning Etruscan and Italian origins, commonly so called, and the division between the archæologists of Bologna who affirm with Professor Brizio that the Etruscans were an Oriental people who came by sea, and that the Umbrians were Aryan Italians, and the archæologists of Rome who affirm with Helbig and Pigorini that the Etruscans were an Italian branch which came from the North and stopped in the valley of the Po before establishing themselves in Etruria.

The problem is this: Are the Umbrians Italians? Are the Italians Aryans? These two questions may be reduced to one: Who were the Italians?

The Italian origin of the peoples of Italy has been established by two very important characteristics,—language and civilisation. The latter is determined by archæological data from the bronze epoch and from the first appearance of iron. The physical characteristics of the population have not been taken account of, because philologists and archæologists in general look upon them as useless and as little susceptible of results.

The Aryan origin of the Italians has also been determined by means of the same two characteristics, linguistic and archæological. Archæologists and philologists have unanimously declared that the Italians are Aryans like the Celts, the Germans, the Slavs, and the Indians. If they had limited themselves to affirming the Aryan origin of the language and civilisation without touching ethnology, they would have been able, perhaps for the most part, to sustain the thesis. But instead of that they have passed into ethnology

without examining the physical characteristics of these Aryan-speaking Italians, and have solemnly affirmed the physical unity of the two races.

It is well known that in the enthusiasm of the first linguistic discoveries which established the unity of origin of the Aryan languages, the physical unity of the peoples speaking the Aryan language was erroneously affirmed. But it is equally well known that the most superficial analysis of the physical characteristics of all these peoples has shown that they belong to different human varieties. To-day the question is to find out who among the different ethnical groups which speak languages of Aryan origin were Aryan, and who among them have assimilated the Aryan language and civilisation or had it imposed upon them.

In Germany especially this question has been warmly discussed. Virchow, although he has been for a long time attempting to solve the problem, has never succeeded. He cannot persuade himself of the fact that the majority of the German-speaking population who settled in the south and central Germany is different in its physical type, especially in its cranial features, from those who are generally looked upon as thoroughly Germanic, and who are found further north, but always in the minority in respect to the great mass of Germans of the brachycephalic type.¹

The difficulty of the solution of the question in regard to two Germanic types is derived above all from the belief that all those who speak German are legitimate Aryans, and from the conviction that the true primitive Germanic type was that of the so-called *Reihengräber*, which is in the minority in respect to the other type which predominates and which is brachycephalic and dark.

I hint at the difficulties of the Germanic problem, because they are not very different from those of the Italian problem. The solution of neither the one nor the other can be found, I believe, without the combination of archæological and linguistic results with anthropological, and without their convergence, when, how-

¹ See Virchow, *Rassenbildung und Erblichkeit*. Festschrift für Bastian. Berlin, 1896.

ever, the latter may not be obtained by rational, or rather natural, methods.

Meanwhile it is useless to show how, in the matter of determining the Italian origin of the primitive inhabitants of Italy, there is no agreement between the linguistic and archæological results. For, while a language with Aryan characteristics divided into many dialects, at least in a few ethnical groups, is found from Umbria to the extremity of the peninsula, the civilisations are diverse, especially in some marked characteristics to which are given an Aryan signification.

According to Brizio the Umbrians should be the Italians *par excellence*, not only on account of the complexity of archæological facts which unite them to the other peoples called Aryan, but also on account of their peculiar funeral custom with its characteristic feature, that is, the cremation of bodies, as it is found in the first age of iron from Bologna to the mouths of the Tiber in all that territory which formed prehistoric Umbria in its most flourishing period, from the Adriatic to the Mediterranean, as is indicated by Herodotus, and as was eventually demonstrated by the archæological discoveries at Villanova, at Certosa of Bologna, at Tarquinia Corneto, at Vetulonia, at Albalonga, and in the district of Rimini.

On the other hand, according to Pigorini, the Italians must have occupied a greater territory, because they extended beyond the region named into the valley of the Po where has been discovered the Terramare, dwellings built on piles driven into the ground. Wherever Pigorini finds archæological objects of the form and character common to the Aryans, and cremation as a funeral rite, he sees Italian-Aryans. And his theory, which is substantially identical with that of Helbig, is very well known.

The Italians, so Pigorini and Helbig maintain, came from the North, occupied the valley of the Po, constructed pile dwellings with some features which recall the four-sided city of primitive Rome. For unknown reasons, before the first age of iron they abandoned them, crossed the Apennines and came into the territory which later became Etruria and founded there the Etruscan cities. Then they pushed into Latium and founded Rome. Hence the

Etruscans and Latins were Aryan Italians, formerly inhabiting the pile dwellings in the region of the Po, to-day brought to light in the Terramare, which contains the remains of dwellings and domestic utensils. Therefore Pigorini believes that these Aryan peoples may have pushed on even to the Ionian Sea.

Apart from the divergence between these two renowned archæologists in the interpretation of the Terramare, in which Brizio thinks he has found the ancient Ligurian Italian stock, both the one and the other find Italian-Aryans wherever they discover the funeral ceremony of cremation associated with bronze, with characteristics common to other European peoples also called Aryans, and both these renowned archæologists accept the supposition that before the Italians emigrated into Italy and the Hellenes into Greece they constituted a single ethnical group, the Greco-Italic, which divided after a time in the Balkan Peninsula.

But not all archæological data of Terramare in the valley of the Po and of Umbria correspond to those of other Italian populations speaking Italian languages of the Aryan type. Cremation as a funeral rite did not exist outside of ancient Umbria and the little territory where Rome was founded. The tombs of Piceno, for example, at Novilara near Pesaro, and those farther south at Alfedena (ancient Aufidena), and others, clearly demonstrate this. How is it that Italians did not all have one funeral rite? Why is there not found the same convergence of archæological facts, so fundamental, as in the linguistic? In other words, proof of the Aryan origin of the Italians has a greater extension in language than in archæology, and in general in civilisation also, if not wholly, at least in part. Archæologists know this very well. Perhaps it will be said that those ethnical groups which are comprehended in the common term, Sabellians, are not Italians. Then the number of Italians, with their territory, would be reduced to less than half the populations which have occupied Italy and which speak the Italian language, which would be absurd.

All this difficulty, all these doubts have not yet been settled by archæology and linguistics, studies which have not been associated with physical anthropology. The latter, it appears to me, by ex-

amining the physical characteristics of the different ethnical groups which are found in Italy may be able to show whether the Italians are Aryans or whether they belong to another human stock different from the Aryans. And as the Umbrians were a people who from archæological discoveries and from linguistic relation appear to have been a branch of the Aryan stock, it is from them that we may be able to gain some useful anthropological knowledge which may prove to be the key to the solution of the Aryan problem in general.

II.

Granted that the Umbrians of Bologna, as of all the Umbrian territory at the time of the first age of iron, burnt their dead, as is shown by the great burying-grounds with charred remains, it would seem that we can never know their osteological characters. But it is known that the Etruscan invasion restored the practice of inhumation in all the Umbrian region, in Western Etruria as well as beyond the Apennines in Felsinean territory. The numerous tombs of the old Certosa of Bologna are an evident demonstration of this; and Nicolucci, Calori, and myself have had many skeletons from those tombs to examine.

The same is true of Western Etruria, in which many skulls have been exhumed and studied, by Nicolucci, Zanetti, Calori, and myself in Italy. Other series of Etruscan skulls are found in many of the museums of Europe. It may be affirmed therefore that the number of skeletons exhumed from the Etruscan tombs, from the whole territory or from that part of it dominated by that people, has been sufficient to give a knowledge of the osteological features of the inhabitants, who had a civilisation of bronze and later of the first age of iron, and the funeral ceremony of cremation.

Now it may be objected that the skulls of which I speak are not Umbrian. I reply at once that they are both Umbrian and Etruscan, because they must belong to the Umbrian population which was conquered by the Etruscan, and to the Etruscan population which conquered. Further on my reply to this objection will be more complete.

I maintain that the Etruscans were a colony of the Eastern Mediterranean with a civilisation which had undergone Asiatic influences, and that they settled upon the shore of the Mediterranean in Umbrian territory, where they became strong and powerful on land and sea, and in consequence had gone to the Apennines and invaded the stronghold, I might say the capital of Umbria, Felsina, where they established new settlements and then extended themselves beyond the valley of the Po, subjecting those populations. Brizio has clearly demonstrated these facts, and I have only to refer the reader to his works.¹

A colony, however large it may be, is necessarily limited in the number of its components. The Etruscan colony must have been composed of some thousands of people. Hence it is easy to suppose, that that colony increased little by little by the fusing of its population with the inhabitants of the occupied territory, who must have been numerous from what is known of the flourishing condition of the Umbrian rule. And it is also easy to think, and admit, that when they made military expeditions and conquests their army was in great part composed of the primitive inhabitants of the conquered territory, that is, of Umbrians.

Now there must have been a time in which no difference could be detected between the colonists, the masses of the people, at least, with their descendents, and the ancient Umbrian inhabitants. Etruria in its more flourishing period, had, from one end to the other, uniform civilisation and customs. The funeral rite of cremation gradually disappeared and was substituted for that of inhumation; even the name Umbrian was lost forever from the western region, and that of Etruria was substituted for it. But the people did not disappear. They were naturally fused with the Etruscans. Without the archæological discoveries of to-day we could not know that Etruria was Umbria. But Brizio shows, by means of the gradual transformation of funeral customs and of the arts, the persistence of the Umbrian people under the Etruscan

¹ Brizio, *La provenienza degli Etruschi, Atti e Memorie di Storia Patria per le Romagne*. Bologna, 1895. *Id. Monumenti archeologici della provincia di Bologna*. 1881.

rule.¹ Nor can it be otherwise, unless one wishes to admit the absurdity that a limited colonisation causes a numerous and dense population entirely to disappear.

If, therefore, all the Umbrians and Etrurians, of whatever origin, practised inhumation, the burying grounds which are called Etruscan ought to contain skulls of Umbrians and Etruscans together.

When Felsina also through the Etruscan invasion became Etruscan, and with Felsina its territory, the dead were inhumed in the Etruscan manner no matter to what nation they belonged. In fact in the period called Etruscan, tombs for cremation, characteristic of that period and of the preceding one, are not found at Certosa of Bologna. Here then the burying grounds ought to furnish us the osteological characteristics of the Felsinean Umbrians.

These considerations are sufficient to present the fact that from the Etruscan tombs of Etruria, and of the Province of Bologna, we may obtain certain knowledge of the physical characteristics of the Umbrians, as well as of the Etruscans, and that the Umbrians did not disappear nor have they disappeared even to-day notwithstanding historic changes.

Only one objection may be presented, and it is this: If in the Etruscan tombs Etruscans and Umbrians are found, how can we distinguish the one from the other? To this objection I shall give further on a satisfactory reply.

III.

Let us now pass to the examination of the human remains obtained from Etruscan and Felsinean tombs, and let us especially concern ourselves with cranial forms, which possess the most certain characteristics of human varieties as studied in their osteological characters.

With the old craniometric method, Nicolucci, Zanetti, Calori, and myself have found two cephalic types, elongated skulls corresponding to the dolichocephalic and mesocephalic craniums, and

¹ *Op. cit.*

short skulls corresponding to the brachycephalic craniums, distributed as follows :¹

CRANIUMS FROM ETRUSCAN TOMBS.							
Nicolucci	Long Type 12			Short Type 6		Total 18	
Zanetti	"	"	13	"	"	4	" 17
Calori	"	"	8	"	"	1	" 9
Sergi	"	"	7	"	"	3	" 10
			Dolichocephalic 40	Brachycephalic 14		Total 54	

or seventy-four per cent. dolicho-mesocephalic; twenty-six per cent. brachycephalic.

FELSINEAN SKULLS, OR FROM THE SO-CALLED ETRUSCAN TOMBS OF BOLOGNA.

Calori	Dolicho-mesocephalic 11		Brachycephalic 5		Total 16
Sergi	"	" 7	"	3	" 10
		Dolicho-mesocephalic 18	Brachycephalic 8		Total 26

or seventy per cent. dolicho-mesocephalic, or thirty per cent. brachycephalic. These figures show that the brachycephalic or short type is in the minority and oscillates between about twenty-six and thirty per cent. in Etruria and in Felsina, a little more than a fourth of the population, and that the long type of skulls oscillates between seventy and seventy-four per cent. But that tells us very little. In order to have a more concrete idea of the differences between the two types it is necessary to examine the cephalic forms according to the natural method, that is the shapes, and then we will be able to compare them with others that are found in other Italian and European populations.

As I have shown in a series of works, dolichocephalic and mesocephalic skulls include the cranial varieties denominated by their forms, ellipsoidal, ovoidal, pentagonal, and some other accessory forms. On the other hand, the brachycephalic correspond to the sphenoidal or large cuneiform, to the platycephalic, divided into several subforms, and to the spheroidal.

The Umbro-Etruscan population of Etruria and Felsina was composed, then, of two ethnical elements quite distinct and well

¹ To speak only of the studies published. The series of Etruscan skulls are very numerous.

determined, that is, of a type with skulls having an ellipsoidal, ovoidal, and pentagonal form, and which was in the majority; and of a type with platycephalic, sphenoidal, spheroidal skulls, which was in the minority.

This has been found to be the fact in the territory where Rome now stands. I have had the good fortune to examine twenty-nine skulls which belonged to the period which has been determined by archæologists to be in part anterior to and in part contemporaneous with the walls of Servius Tullius, that is to say, with a time which goes back to the beginning of Rome.

Among these twenty-nine skulls I have found only four which may be said to be foreign to the majority of the element dominating in the population, that is, a square platycephalic, a pentagonal platycephalic, and two sphenoidal. The other forms belong to the category dominating among the Etruscan and Umbrian, that is the ellipsoidal, ovoidal, and pentagonal.¹

To the anthropological observation may be added the archæological. Roman territory presents a fact almost identical with that of the Umbrian and Umbro-Etruscan territory, that is, there is found there, in an age anterior to the foundation of Rome, the funeral ceremony of cremation along with archæological objects identical with the Umbrian. But there is found contemporaneously also the custom of inhumation, that is to say, the custom there was a mixed one. This is a fact of great importance, because it indicates that the practice of cremation had not yet taken strong root in the entire population, as it had done in all Umbria.

We may admit, then, and with much certainty, that in Italian districts where is found the rite of cremation along with objects of the first age of iron, later, and in our case in the Umbro-Latin territory, the population having given up the custom, and turned to burying the dead, has shown itself to be composed of two different ethnical elements, distinguishable by means of the cephalic types, one of which was more largely represented than the other. In both

¹ See Sergi, *Studi di antropologia laziale*. Rome, 1895.

of the territories examined the two types are respectively homogeneous and reveal two different stocks.

Let us pass now to other Italian territories where the custom of burning the dead is not found in the most ancient times, that is, from the first age of iron to the bronze period.

Of these territories it is sufficient to mention the two most interesting and conclusive, Novilara near Pesaro, and Alfedena in Samnium.

In Novilara among forty-five heads which I have examined, I have encountered no type which suggested that already seen in Etruria, in Felsina and in the Roman territory as the minor element of the mixed population,—no sphenoidal, platycephalic, or spheroidal forms. The forty-five skulls were on the contrary all of the elongated type, ellipsoidal, ovoidal, and pentagonal, forms peculiar to the ethnical element which prevailed in Etruria and in Umbria, as well as in the territory of Rome.

Brizio who splendidly illustrates the discoveries of Novilara finds inhumation with special characteristics, that is, with folded positions of the body. He attributes those tombs to the Ligurians, who are only a branch of the great Mediterranean stock.¹ I am inclined to the belief that they belonged to the Pelasgians who were another branch of the same stock, akin to the Ligurians, and that the primitive population of Italy, excepting some small part, were Pelasgo-Ligurians.²

The other burying ground is that of Alfedena, the ancient Aulfedena, perhaps, on the Sangro, to the east of Latium. This burying-ground is conspicuous both on account of its extent and also on account of its showing a succession of epochs. Its history appears to extend from the eighth to the fourth century before Christ. No sign of the rite of cremation has been found there.³ I have had a superb collection of thirty well-preserved skulls exhumed from that burying ground by Professor De Amicis. It seems as if I had chosen

¹ Brizio, *Il sepolcreto di Novilara presso Pesaro*. Rome, 1895.

² Sergi, *Origine e diffusione della stirpe mediterranea*. Rome, 1895.

³ Cf. *Notizie d'antichità e scavi*. Rome, 1895, 1897.

them myself in order to demonstrate my assumption. They all have the beautiful elongated forms, ellipsoidal, ovoidal, and pentagonal, like those of the type found among the Felsinean, Etruscan, and Roman skulls from the primitive age of the founding of Rome. There is not a single skull of the other type having a spheroidal or platycephalic form.

I could mention other burying grounds where the rite of cremation does not appear, and where the cranial forms found in them are of the same type as those of Novilara and of Alfedena. But I think the two mentioned, and studied by me directly, are sufficient to show that wherever in ancient times the custom of burning the dead did not penetrate, the type of population reveals only a single ethnical element; but, on the other hand, wherever that custom did penetrate there are found two ethnical elements with different characteristics, a fact which suggests that there must have been two human stocks intermingled.

IV.

After what has been said, the problem is this: To what stock do the dolicho-mesocephalic skulls with elliptical, pentagonal, and ovoidal forms belong, and to what other stock do the brachycephalic skulls with sphenoidal, spheroidal, and platycephalic forms belong?

Only a comparison with other populations of Europe can give the solution of this problem.

The brachycephalic forms above indicated are found among the Celts, Slavs, and the Southern Germans especially, while the others, or the dolichocephalic forms, are found among the populations of the Mediterranean, and hence among the majority of the inhabitants of Italy. Already the reader will have discovered for himself that if in the Italian burying grounds without ethnical mixture the type is one, and if in those with mixed type the dominant one is the same as in the first, the Italian must necessarily be the one which includes the elongated, pentagonal, ellipsoidal, and ovoidal forms, and the other must be a foreign type mingled with the former.

When could this second cephalic type, which suggests a people foreign to the Italians, have come in? Even here the reply is easy, and to obtain an indication of the time of their advent it will be sufficient to refer to the epoch of the Etruscan, Felsinean, and Roman burying grounds.

In order that the skulls of both stocks, the Italian and the foreign, should be mingled in the same Etruscan burying ground, it must be admitted that the ethnical elements which had these cranial characteristics inhabited that territory in an age anterior to the Etruscan occupation, that is, to the Umbrian rule, and this may go back to the tenth century, and even beyond the common era. The same thing may be said of the Felsinean and the Roman, because the two ethnical elements must have been fused without distinction or they would not have been buried indifferently in the same tombs. So, as before the Etruscan colonisation both formed one people, in the Etruscan rule they entered as elements of the Etruscan population.

We have still another proof that these ethnical elements foreign to the Italian stock entered in prehistoric times, and this proof is derived from the period of the burying grounds themselves in which these skulls were found. The Etruscan burying-grounds date from the seventh to the fifth century at least; those of Rome anterior to or contemporaneous with the Servian walls belong to the sixth century, and those of Certosa of Bologna to the fifth. That is, all are anterior to any historic invasion from the North, and therefore are earlier than the fourth century which is the epoch of the Gallic invasion. I have no need to show that the Etruscan burying-grounds of Bologna are anterior to the Gallic conquest, for Brizio among others has clearly demonstrated it.¹

The Italians therefore from their ethnology belong to the Mediterranean stock. In a prehistoric epoch there was an invasion from the North and the Northwest which reached only a little beyond the banks of the Tiber. This invasion was made by a people which had the physical characteristics of the Celts, and the Slavs, and

¹ Brizio, *Monumenti archeologici*, cit.

the modern Southern Germans, and differed therefore in their physical characteristics from the Italians. I do not hesitate to call this stock ARYAN, and therefore to affirm that the foreign skulls found in the Etruscan, Felsinean, and Roman burying-grounds are Aryan. *The Italians, therefore, anthropologically considered are not Aryans. The Umbrians, however, are Italians mixed with Aryans, but chiefly Italian in the proportional number of the population.*

V.

If these are the facts which result from both archæological and anthropological researches, which are in full harmony, let us interpret them and reconstruct the history which is written only in the monuments and in the bones of the two different stocks; and of the latter the skulls especially, persisting in their forms, are the true mile-stones of the migrations of the people and of their relations.

The Mediterranean stock had invaded and occupied a great part of Europe, and Italy had already received among its first inhabitants two branches of the same stock, Ligurians and Pelasgians, while the Greeks had especially the Pelasgian. Other secondary ethnical elements were doubtless mixed with these two principal branches of the great stock, but in such a minority as not to be able to destroy the unity of origin. The Ligurians and the Pelasgians had common physical forms, and the differences being accessory it would be out of place to discuss them here. It appears that the whole peninsula including the valley of the Po was occupied by these first inhabitants who had a civilisation which was Mediterranean, the most developed part of which was oriental or Mycenaean. According to Flinders Petrie, Mycenaean civilisation was already flourishing sixteen hundred years before Christ.

Probably the northern region of Italy or the valley of the Po was less advanced, and Europe was in the neolithic or even the eneolithic age, the age of copper, as seems to be ascertained, when tribes of savage and barbarous people of a special physical type and furnished with arms of bronze, advanced from the East. They invaded Europe in various directions and drove away or conquered

the primitive inhabitants, according to the greater or less resistance met with.

The customs of these invaders were different from those of the first inhabitants. They burned their dead and preserved the charred bones in rude vases of earthenware. They were inferior in civilisation to eneolithic peoples who, with those of the preceding and therefore more ancient period issuing from the palæolithic were acquainted with writing, as is shown by the discoveries of Mas d'Azil,¹ by the sculptured stones of the dolmens and other monuments;² and they knew how to carve in wood, in bone, and in ivory with a skill which is wonderful for such a primitive age.³ They had a very beautiful ceramics. Probably these migratory tribes came from central Asia, but before they moved toward middle and central Europe they perhaps stopped in the most eastern part of Europe, that is in Russia, and from there, in groups more or less numerous, pushed on toward the West. We cannot know how much time they spent in their movements; but it is certain that in the various groups which they formed, these people in an indeterminate epoch divided into many branches, constituting nations distinct in language, in customs and in other features, according to local and regional conditions.

The first groups, to consider their ancient and modern geographical position, must have been those who afterward historically preserved the name of Celts; the second, a little later than the first, were Germans, who frequently mingled with them. A third group, the last to arrive, was that which afterward took the name of Slavs and was very numerous. We may call these three branches of one human family, Proto-Slavs, Proto-Germans, and Proto-Celts, since in that prehistoric epoch they did not have the modern or historical names, but they were doubtless the ancestors of the three modern branches which bear these names.

The invasions of these numerous and strong peoples covered

¹ Cf. Piette, "Les Galets coloriés du Mas d'Azil." In *Anthropologie*, 1896.

² Letourneau, "Les signes alphabétiques du dolmen des Marchand." *Bulletin société anthrop. de Paris*, 1893.

³ Piette, "La station di Brassempouy." *Anthrop.* 1895.

an immense area in Europe. They invaded France, Great Britain, Germany, Switzerland, and other western and northern regions. They invaded Italy from the North, and all the Balkan region. Nor was the Iberian Peninsula spared. Any one who visits the prehistoric museums of Europe, those of Switzerland, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, and Trieste, and observes the archæological data discovered in the territory of the Celts, Germans, and Slavs, may obtain an idea of the civilisation of the stock called Aryan, which has a common fund of handiwork, together with the common custom of burning the dead, which shows a civilisation common in origin ; but that this unity soon became a varied multiplicity on account of the regional and national developments of each people or part of a people.

The comparison of the civilisations above mentioned with that of the valley of the Po in Terramare and with that of Umbria show that both the first and the second are derived from a common Aryan, while in Umbria, the later development had another origin, as I shall show farther on. Hence I call this civilisation Aryan, as the archæologists also call it. But the manner of the introduction of this civilisation, and of the people who imported it, have not received a satisfactory interpretation, it seems to me, in the current opinion of philologists and archæologists. Anthropology with the archæological data may give a solution to this difficulty, and lighten up the obscurity which now reigns there.

The Aryans invaded Italy probably by two ways : by the central Alps and by the eastern Alps. From the North or through the central Alps came the Proto-Celts and occupied a great part of the valley of the Po down to Piedmont toward the West, and to the Province of Bologna toward the East, and occupied the pile dwellings, in whole or in part, especially those constructed upon the dry land known to-day by the name of Terramare. From the Northeast the Proto-Slavs who before this movement toward Italy had occupied a wide territory toward the East, and these took possession of the region about Venice, establishing themselves on the borders of the Proto-Celts to the West and South of the province of Bologna. The Proto-Celts came in the pure bronze age. In

Terramare iron is not found and the primitive bronze is of the archaic forms.

That the invaders were the ancestors of the Celts in the valley of the Po, which includes Lombardy, Piedmont, and Emilia, is shown by the archæological fact of the Aryan civilisation, and the type of population which occupies it and has occupied it from prehistoric times.

The same may be affirmed of the Venetians who were also Aryans and Proto-Slavs with osteological features identical for the most part with the Celts and their ancestors. Hence it may be affirmed that the Aryan invasion in the valley of the Po was almost complete and brought there the civilisation along with the population.

But if the Italians, that is the Mediterranean races, were expelled more or less completely from the regions about the Po down almost to the territory of Bologna, at this place the resistance and the struggle between the Italians and the Aryans must have been greater. But the victory was with the Aryans, as was early shown by archæological and anthropological discoveries. They overthrew the Italians and founded Felsina, to-day called Bologna, or made it their principal settlement. The victory, however, did not produce the same effect that we see in the region of the Po, that is, the almost complete expulsion of the ancient inhabitants. On the contrary there was an Aryan rule with a fusion of two peoples, because, from the anthropological data examined, it is found that the Italians remained in the majority in the Umbrian population.

From Felsina the Aryans pushed on to the Adriatic on the one side, and on the other they passed beyond the Apennines and conquered in the same manner the population down to the right of the Tiber, which marks the borders of the Umbrian rule, but they did not stop there. They passed beyond it and attempted to extend their dominion. They occupied a few places, and one of their settlements was at Albalonga. Here have been discovered the remains of their civilisation with the funeral rite of cremation.

The name Umbrian is probably not Italian. The people of that name were derived from a part of the Aryans who invaded the

territory and became dominant. But it is a fact worthy of consideration that their civilisation greatly developed, and was superior to that of any other contemporaneous Aryan people, if we except Este and later Watsch and Hallstatt where is found a civilisation which seems to be one with the Umbrian or an uninterrupted continuation of that at Felsina, at Hallstatt, and in the valley of the Danube down to Bosnia and Herzegovina.



MAP OF THE FIRST IRON-AGE—VILLANOVA-HALLSTATT.

If we recall the anthropological characteristics of the population which extended from the valley of the Danube toward the West in Carinzia, in Carniola down to Venice in Italy, we must admit that in origin they belong to the Proto-Slavs, or Illyrians according to the historical ethnical name. If we remember that the Venetians in the region of the Po, which they occupied, were a very ancient colony we must necessarily affirm that besides a Celtic

current in Italy there was one from another Aryan branch, that is the Slavic.

If then we think that the civilisation of Felsina, so rich, had continued more in the Slavic zone than in the Celtic, and that in spite of the relations with that of the Terramare both seem distinct and independent, we must still admit that the people of the Terramare remained stationary down to their conquest, first made by the Umbrian and then by the Etruscans. It is not possible to think, as Pigorini believes, that the people of the Terramare abandoned their territory and their settlements after they had settled there. Probably he is induced to make this supposition, which Helbig also makes, by the fact that he sees that these people made no progress while the Umbrians were at the height of their civilisation. The people of Terramare remained separated and isolated in the movement of Aryan and Mediterranean civilisation, when these met and resulted in the great development of the Umbrian civilisation. They then scattered, were lost in the obscurity of primitive history or overcome by more advanced populations down to the Gallic invasion.

There is no doubt that the great evolution of the Umbrian civilisation and of that beyond the borders of Umbria, at Este, at Watsch, and at Hallstatt, was due to the influx of the Mediterranean civilisation. Without these Italy with the rest of Europe would have remained in barbarism. Because, as it is easy to show, the neolithic, and even the eneolithic civilisation of Europe, was much superior to that imported by the Aryans. This is shown by the use of writing known in Europe before the neolithic age, and by the very fine ceramics, and by the art of carving in ivory, in bone, and in wood.¹

The Aryans on the contrary plunged the people of Europe, and even those of the peninsulas of the Mediterranean, into the darkest barbarism, and they would have remained there if the new currents from the East of the Mediterranean had not brought at a

¹ See the discoveries, referred to above, at Mas d'Azil, at Brassempouy and elsewhere.

later period other civilising influences. This fact demands a fuller demonstration than can be given here and this I mean to furnish in a later publication.¹

The Umbrian rule would have extended itself still more toward the South to Italy, and would probably have occupied the whole of Latium if Etruscan civilisation had not come in to interrupt the progress of Umbrian expansion. As has already been said, the Etruscans occupied Mediterranean Umbria and very much reduced the Umbrian territory. They changed the civilisation for the most part, introducing their own, restored to the Italians their funeral custom of inhumation, and finally destroyed the Umbrian power by the invasion and occupation of Felsina.

The Etruscans, as is shown by my anthropological researches, were also a branch of the Mediterranean stock, eastern Pelasgians, inhabitants of Western Asia, with a civilisation much advanced with oriental institutions and characteristics. Their physical characteristics are therefore those of the Mediterranean stock, of which the Italians are a branch. For this reason it is impossible to distinguish their skulls in the Etruscan and Felsinean tombs from those of the Italians, which have the same forms. I have Etruscan skulls from Cere and from Orvieto which are typically identical with those from Alfedena and Rome. If then in the Etrusco-Felsinean burying grounds there are two ethnical elements, as has been seen, the one Aryan and the other Italian, the latter is not different from the Etruscan. This does not disturb in the least our previous demonstration.

The colonisation had various effects among which was disaster to the Aryan rule in that region, which was then Umbria, and an extraordinary effect upon the civilisation and dominion of the truly Italian element. Because that part of Latium which had been already invaded by the Umbrians was freed from the Aryans by the Etruscan invasion from the North, and was free forever.

Hence it happened that that nucleus of races had already felt the Aryan influence, and afterward the Etruscans, freed from for-

¹ This will be published under the title of *Arü e Italici*.

eign rule, founded Rome, upon the left bank of the Tiber, as a bulwark against invasions and the dangers threatened by a new power which was substituted for the Aryan, that is, the Etruscans collected on the right bank of the Tiber, who had not delayed in conquering Latium as they had conquered Western Umbria, and afterward the region beyond the Apennines.

With the origin of Rome the Italians acquired an independent state, extended themselves into Latium, destroyed the rule of the Etruscans, with whom they soon entered into conflict, and created the Latin civilisation which is truly called Italian. The earlier people, the Aryan or Umbrian, and the Etruscan, were foreign. It is true that the Aryan civilisation contributed something new, but it was more the Etruscan civilisation which brought new influences and elevated the Italians of Latium to a superior rank. But both civilisations were importations of foreign peoples. The Latin civilisation rose above them and with its own very marked characteristics from which emerged the peculiar grandeur of the whole Mediterranean civilisation.

This appears to me to have been the general history of that people which is called Italian, and of the so-called Aryan civilisation. It is shown directly and clearly by archæological and anthropological facts.

From this history there may be obtained another interpretation of the origin of the Italian languages with the Aryan inflection, that is, the Latin, Umbrian, Sabellian and other languages were transformed into Italian by the influence and domination of the Aryan. But that does not make Italians of the Aryan people who came into Italy with a language already formed, as is admitted by philologists. It might be shown that the same phenomena happened in Greece which was transformed by the Aryan invasion. This is clearly shown, if it is true that the primitive Aryans were a people divided into three principal branches which to-day bear three ethnical names.

Thus we have arrived at the establishment of the facts that the Aryans were represented in antiquity by the ancestors of the Celts, the Germans, and the Slavs; that no Italian people and no Hel-

lenic people were among the Aryans ; that the Aryans were foreign to Italy, a stock different in physical features ; that the Aryans were not the creators of the two great classical civilisations, the Latin and the Greek, because they were barbarous and inferior to the people of Italy and Greece ; that their greater influence was exerted in transforming the languages spoken in the two nations and not upon the civilisation. The civilisation was Mediterranean, a civilisation which for the third time became dominant in the Basin of the Mediterranean in Europe.

G. SERGI.

ROME, ITALY.